

CMER
October 16, 2003
NWIFC Conference Center
Minutes

Attendees:

Butts, Sally	USFWS
Calhoun, John	ONRC
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Dominquez, Larry	DNR
Ehinger, Bill	Ecology
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
Glass, Domoni	Glass Environmental Consulting
Godbout, Kevin	Weyerhaeuser
Harlow, Eric	WFLC
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Ignacio, Rafino	DNR (Contracts Administrator)
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental, CMER co-chair
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McNaughton, Geoff	DNR, AMPA
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Consultants
Palmquist, Bob	NWIFC
Peterson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Price, Dave	WDFW
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Quinn, Tim	WDFW, CMER co-chair
Risenhoover, Ken	Port Blakely
Robinson, Tom	WSAC
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC
Smitch, Curt	Thompson Consulting Group
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR

Minutes: Minutes from the July and September CMER meetings were approved as amended. Action items from September were reviewed.

Decisions and Tasks

Decisions and Tasks	Minutes Section
IAC Overhead Charges: Policy is looking into the matter. Update at the November CMER meeting.	Budget Update
Dawn Pucci and Andy McMillan are now co-chairing WETSAG	Sag Issues
SAGs need more participation – especially project managers.	SAG Issues
A process was outlined regarding how to move reports to Policy for review A process for CMER review of draft reports prior to SRC review was outlined.	Process to Move Reports
CMER recommends that this report move forward to SRC following agreement on framing the additional question raised by a reviewer, adding the ISAG questions, and review by McNaughton.	ISAG Last Fish
This report will be forwarded to SRC review when agreement between the reviewers and the PIs has been reached on the questions. As noted above, McNaughton will review the final questions and will then take responsibility for forwarding the report to SRC. If agreement is not reached, this issue will come before CMER at the November meeting for resolution.	DFC Report
CMER recommends that the 2001 report now be forwarded to the Policy committee for their consideration. CMER, at the last meeting, decided not to send this study to SRC for review.	PIP Report
A process for considering outside research was outlined briefly.	Outside Research

CMER Website Comments:

- A CMER meeting calendar will be added to the site
- SAG co-chairs will continue to be listed as contacts for SAG meeting dates and minutes
- Draft reports will not be posted on the website
- RFPs and job opportunities will be posted on the site in a specific location.

- The CMER workplans for 2003 and 2004 will be posted.

SRC Review: McNaughton updated the group that two BTSAG Reports have been submitted to SRC for review. The open review process is supported by the managing editor at UW. A discussion regarding how SRC comments should be delivered to the authors was suggested by Butts. The authors want to know which comments they will see from the SRC review. CMER was supportive of sharing all SRC comments with the authors of the report. CMER may want authors to address only a few of the comments; but the authors would like to see all SRC comments. McNaughton reminded the group that the associate editor's report is the public document.

Budget Update: McNaughton said that there have been few changes since the workshop last month. LWAG suggested an edit for the out years that will be incorporated this afternoon. The \$800,000 for LHZ is a biennial figure, not an annual figure. This budget sheet now available more accurately reflects that spending pattern. A WETSAG project was also moved to the right as they are having difficulties locating sites for the pilot study. The bottom line is that the annual variance indicates that \$2 million from 2003 will be unspent. An additional sheet reflecting what is currently under contract and what contracts have been completed was distributed for review. Contact Geoff McNaughton for copies of either distribution.

IAC overhead charges: Quinn said that the policy co-chairs did agree to move forward and find out why these charges are now being applied and whether these charges are appropriate.

SAG Issues

- SAGE – no issues
 - RSAG – still have only one co-chair
 - BTSAG – needs more members.
 - WETSAG – Andy McMillan and Dawn Pucci are now co-chairing
 - ISAG – no issues
 - LWAG – no issues
 - UPSAG – no issues
 - SAG workloads are heavy and all SAGs need more participants – especially project managers.
-

Science conference: The Adaptive Management project is scheduled for February 24th, 2004 and an announcement will be out Friday. There is no fee for the conference and presenters have been identified. Jackson raised a concern about including presentations on research being conducted outside the CMER process. Quinn said that everyone who has CMER data will be included if they want to present. Martin added that the purpose of

the conference is to include all CMER research and to inform people about what is going on that is closely related to CMER.

Quinn indicated that the concern really is focusing around bringing in outside research—such as fish passage – will unduly influence CMER research and thinking. There were additional concerns raised about the fact that CMER needs to consider outside research and has a budget deficit in out years that will require CMER to work with others to answer questions. Martin clarified that this is a CMER sponsored Conference and will highlight CMER work.

Process to Move Reports: CMER co-chairs met with the policy oversight committee and informed them that reports will be coming forward soon. A discussion of how CMER should convey this information to policy followed. The stakeholders were identified as the group that will inform policy about the implications of the study. Quinn, Martin and McNaughton are the people who will present the information to policy. The questions policy wants answered when studies come forward are:

- 1) What does the report say?
- 2) How sure is CMER of the results?
- 3) What does the report not tell us?
- 4) What other studies is CMER working on that address the questions not answered by the study?

A process for dealing with the comments received on draft reports proceeding to SRC for review was also discussed by the co-chairs and outlined in a memo to CMER earlier this week. Please see the memo for details. Importantly, if there are disputes about how to move these comments forward, the CMER core group will be polled for their responses. Only comments that were received by the deadline will be considered here today.

If there are additional critical flaws identified, the SRC should identify those and comment on them. If there is further review of the document following SRC review, it should not result in additional findings of critical flaws. CMER will address the comments of SRC and any critical flaws identified through SRC review. This process will involve additional CMER comment. There were concerns raised with this process as it was not clear to everyone at the onset of the recent reviews. The process has not been clarified and in the future, will be as follows:

- CMER will have at least 30 days to review studies prior to SRC review unless otherwise agreed upon at a CMER meeting.
- During this review, all comments should be made – a thorough review is expected. The date of the CMER meeting where the comments will be considered by CMER will be explicitly stated in the review. Those who make comments are expected to be at the meeting to state their reasoning and allow the PI to respond to the comment. To

a large extent, PIs will work with reviewers before the CMER meeting to resolve the concerns.

- Following that, comments received on the study will be discussed and handled in one of the ways outlined in the memo.
 - Questions generated for SRC that are obtained as a result of comments received will be reviewed by the PI and the reviewer who will attempt to reach agreement on the question to be sent. If the dispute cannot be resolved between the PI and the reviewer, CMER will be asked for additional comment.
 - The document will then be forwarded to SRC for review.
 - When comments come back from SRC and are addressed by the PI, CMER will have a chance to review these responses and discuss the outcomes.
 - Following that, the document will be finalized.
-

ISAG – Last Fish: McDonald said that there is a deadline of March 2004 for a new watertyping system to be in place for western Washington. ISAG is working within the timeframe driven by policy to get this done. Quinn did note that policy can recommend a change in this deadline if they want too.

There was one comment received which will be forwarded to SRC for review. The PI will work with the reviewer to frame the question and agreement is expected. Other comments were either resolved or relate to implementation or policy considerations. The questions will be reviewed by McNaughton and then forwarded to SRC for review.

Concerns were raised about how stakeholders will get informed about the results of this study. Price indicated that there will be many opportunities for stakeholders to get informed including workshops and meetings.

Consensus: CMER recommends that this report move forward to SRC following agreement on framing the additional question raised by a reviewer, adding the ISAG questions, and review by McNaughton.

DFC Report: McConnell provided a summary for review. They received three sets of comments. RSAG met and categorized the questions into three categories 1) clarifying, 2) policy and 3) technical and discussed how those would be addressed. RSAG also agreed on how they would address those questions. They planned to discuss comments with one particular reviewer who raised several contentious issues. Two questions for SRC review were identified as a result of the comments. RSAG came up with additional questions as well. McConnell indicated that RSAG did not see any critical flaws in the comments received. However, the reviewers will still have an opportunity express their concerns and whether they believe that these are critical flaws in the report.

Calhoun said that he is not the one who formulated the comments. He has talked with McConnell and does not believe that the group will be completely satisfied with the RSAG response at this time. The core concerns have been addressed with two questions

being forwarded to SRC for review. McConnell will work directly with the reviewers who actually drafted the comments, formulate questions and reach agreement.

CMER Consensus: This report will be forwarded to SRC review when agreement between the reviewers and the PIs has been reached on the questions. As noted above, McNaughton will review the final questions and will then take responsibility for forwarding the report to SRC. If agreement is not reached, this issue will come before CMER at the November meeting for resolution.

PIP Study: There were no critical flaws identified in the PIP study. There were a number of Tribes that collected PIP data during the summer of 2002. The NP group looked at this data and agrees that it was properly collected but it will not be included in the 2001 report.

Palmquist said that there were three sets of comments received. Two sets were strictly word-smithing and the third set did have some substantive questions but they were mainly issues that have now been discussed and the objection has been withdrawn. Peterson said that they remain concerned with the lack of data for the eastside in this report.

CMER Consensus: CMER recommends that the 2001 report now be forwarded to the Policy committee for their consideration. CMER, at the last meeting, decided not to send this study to SRC for review.

How CMER will consider outside research: The research needs to be published by the author and peer reviewed. Then it will become part of the literature that CMER uses. Stakeholders work through their policy representatives and inform them about the body of research available. When the research is considered at policy, policy will note the information that they are receiving and may ask CMER to summarize the data for them.

CMER Workplan:

- Step 1: revise the numbers
- Step 2: Review the numbers
- Step 3: Prioritize based on the new numbers

Steps one and two were completed. During the Friday meeting, CMER will address step three.